

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-14, 16-20 have been amended and resubmitted. Claim 15 and 21 are cancelled.

The drawings were objected to for failing to show reference characters mentioned in the description and for containing reference callouts not described. Figure 5 has been corrected and the specification has been amended to correct this informality.

Claim 1-5, 8-11, 14-16 & 19-21 were rejected under 35USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Powers 4915088. Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitation, said sighting groove having a length such that misalignment of the bow will cause a portion of the groove to obscure a view through the groove.

This feature is not shown in Powers or any of the prior art. While Powers uses a groove 30 to sight a pin above the target, misalignment of the bow will not cause the groove 30 to obscure the pin 44a. Rather a misalignment of the bow will simply cause the arrow to fly left or right depending upon the direction of misalignment. The critical difference between Powers and the present invention in this regard is that the present invention sights the target and aligns the bow using a single pin as reference. Powers attempts to use two pins one 44b in Figure 3 on the target and a second 44a aligned with a V notch to control bow tilt. With reference to figure 4 the bow can still be aimed left or right of the target while maintaining both pins 44a and 44b in the position shown 44a on the groove and 44b on the target. Powers does not use groove length to obscure a view as disclosed and claimed in claim 1.

Original claim 5 contains the limitation 'such that said sight guide will obscure the archer's view below the V shaped cross section'. Power's does not show this feature. In fact Powers requires that the V notch be small so that pins below it are visible. Figure 4 shows that if the archer's view were obscured below the V that the target 114 would be obscured as well. This is obviously contrary to the operation of Powers.

Claim 8 has been amended to contain the limitation said rear sight including a pair of alignment marks that align with a pin on said forward sight only when said bow is properly aligned and wherein said pin is obscured when said bow is misaligned. Powers does not disclose alignment marks.

Original claim 10 contained the limitation, "a distance from the front edge to the rear edge defining a thickness of the rear sight such that a misalignment of an eye of the archer relative to the rear sight will obscure the archer's view of the front sight through the rear sight". Referring again to Figure 4 the groove 30 of Powers will not obscure the archer's view of the front sight through the rear sight, in fact the pins 44a, 44b and notch 30 and target 114 can appear just in the orientation shown in Figure 4 and the arrow can travel to the left or right of the target. Further, Power's never uses the thickness of the rear sight to obscure the view. Powers treats the V notch as a two dimensional object.

Claim 14 as amended includes the limitation, wherein said sighting assembly includes a block with a sight groove having a length in said direction such that an archer's view through said groove will be obscured by the block if said groove is turned. Powers does not show this limitation as noted above.

Claim 19 as amended contains the limitation, said sighting groove having a length such that misalignment of the bow will cause a portion of the groove to obscure a view through said groove. Powers does not show this limitation as noted above.

Claims 6,7,12,13,17 and 18 are rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Powers in view of London.

The lights 76,78 are **not alignment marks** as claimed and disclosed. The lights 76,78 are indicator lights that are computer driven and that indicate tilt of the bow. These lights 76,78 are on the front sight not the rear sight and do not

cooperate with the V groove in any way. The lights 76,78 do not align in any way...they simply indicate a condition determined by the computer.

If Powers was modified by the computer and indicator light of London the resulting device would still not provide the alignment function of the present device. Specifically, the indicator lights of London light in a tilt situation that is the same tilt situation as Powers indicates so the combination would still only indicate tilt and would not indicate the misalignment to the left or right which is one of the misalignments indicted by the present invention. Therefore the combination if made would not provide the function of the current device as disclosed and claimed.

London does demonstrate the need for the current device. London uses a peep sight 16 and the narrow dark field of a peep sight is what drives the requirement for lighted pins in London. It is this narrow dark field that drove the present invention.

CONCLUSION

Based on the remarks above it is felt that claims are now in condition for allowance.

In the event the examiner wishes to discuss any aspect of this response, please contact the agent at the telephone number identified below.

Respectfully submitted,

By:

Mark Manley

Agent 36592 of